

Isospin in B Decays and the ($B^0\overline{B}^0$)/(B^+B^-) Production Ratio ¹

Michael Gronau and Yuval Grossman

*Department of Physics, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology
Technion City, 32000 Haifa, Israel*

and

Jonathan L. Rosner

*Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637*

ABSTRACT

Methods are proposed for measuring the ratio $R^{+/0} = \Gamma(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^+B^-)/\Gamma(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\overline{B}^0)$ without assuming isospin invariance in exclusive hadronic decays such as $B \rightarrow J/\psi K$. The validity of isospin invariance in various B decays is discussed. Isospin violations are expected to be especially small in inclusive semileptonic decays, so that $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow X_c^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow X_c^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$ is expected to hold at the sub-percent level. Suggestions are made for utilizing this relation. The accuracy of a “double-tag” method for obtaining $R^{+/0}$, such as that used for measuring the $D^+D^-/D^0\overline{D}^0$ ratio at the $\psi'' \equiv \psi(3770)$, is also estimated.

The ratio

$$R^{+/0} = \frac{\Gamma(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^+B^-)}{\Gamma(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\overline{B}^0)} \quad (1)$$

is a fundamental quantity in the comparison of B^+ and B^0 branching ratios. In the limit of negligible isospin-violating effects, one expects $R^{+/0} = 1$, but various Coulomb and other isospin-violating corrections can induce corrections of as much as 20% to this value [1].

The BaBar Collaboration has recently obtained $R^{+/0} = 1.006 \pm 0.036 \pm 0.031$ [2], by assuming equal rates for $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0$. This value dominates the current world average of 1.020 ± 0.034 [3]. The assumption of equal rates in $B^{+,0} \rightarrow$

¹To be published as a Brief Report in Physical Review D.

$J/\psi K^{+,0}$ is based on isospin invariance and on neglecting $\Delta I = 1$ contributions. The latter assumption is reasonable because the dominant quark process contributing to these decays is $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c}c\bar{s}$, which has $\Delta I = 0$. Effects which result in deviation from equal rates were estimated in Ref. [4] to amount to no more than a percent in rate difference. However, no rigorous upper bound was established. Moreover, measuring $R^{+/0}$ by assuming $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+) = \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0)$ is not formally correct. It attempts to measure isospin breaking in one process by assuming isospin invariance in another. One would rather measure $R^{+/0} - 1$, which is leading order in isospin breaking, without assuming isospin symmetry at all, or by assuming it to hold in a process where isospin breaking is much suppressed.

The BaBar Collaboration also has measured the fraction f_{00} of $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays to $B^0 \bar{B}^0$ using a comparison of single and double production of $D^{*\pm} \ell \nu_\ell$, obtaining $f_{00} = 0.487 \pm 0.010 \pm 0.008$ without assuming isospin invariance [5]. However, without a direct measurement of the corresponding ratio f_{+-} of $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays to $B^+ B^-$, one cannot exclude the possibility of some non- $B\bar{B}$ decays of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ (for which only an upper limit of 4% exists [6]) which could lead to differences between f_{00} and f_{+-} of up to a few percent.

In the present note we discuss two alternative methods for determining $R^{+/0}$ which are not subject to the assumption of isospin in $B \rightarrow J/\psi K$. The first utilizes the expectation of equal semileptonic decay rates $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow X_c^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow X_c^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$ up to terms of order $1/m_b^3$. The second utilizes the “double tag” method which has been successful in measuring the corresponding ratio for D mesons at the $\psi'' \equiv \psi(3770)$ [7, 8].

We begin with a discussion of the order of isospin-violating effects in exclusive and inclusive B decays. In general, consider exclusive final states $f^{+,0}$. If isospin invariance implies $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow f^+) = \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f^0)$, as in the case $f = J/\psi K$, then

$$A_f \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow f^+) - \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f^0)}{\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow f^+) + \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f^0)} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_I) \quad , \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_I \sim (m_d - m_u)/\Lambda_{QCD}$ with Λ_{QCD} a typical hadronic scale, represents an isospin breaking effect. That is, the isospin breaking effects enter at leading order in ϵ_I and at zeroth order in $1/m_b$ [9, 10]. Basically, while some isospin-breaking effects do scale like $1/m_b$, there are others, such as those in form factors, that do not, and are present even in the $m_b \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

On the other hand, for inclusive semileptonic final states, $f = X_c \ell^+ \nu_\ell$, one has

$$A_{X_c \ell \nu} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\epsilon_I}{m_b^2}\right) \quad . \quad (3)$$

In inclusive semileptonic decays to charm, one can use heavy quark symmetry to classify the terms which affect semileptonic decay rates [11]. At leading order, the decay is described by a decay of a free b quark. There are no $\mathcal{O}(1/m_b)$ terms and at order $1/m_b^2$ there are two: a kinetic term, parameterized by λ_1 , and a QCD hyperfine term, parameterized by λ_2 . These terms depend on the isospin of the spectator quark. We generally expect the isospin breaking in λ_i ($i = 1, 2$) to be of order ϵ_I . For example,

$$\lambda_2^{(u)} - \lambda_2^{(d)} = \frac{1}{4} \left[m^2(B^{+*}) - m^2(B^+) - m^2(B^{0*}) + m^2(B^0) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Thus, the total effect of isospin breaking on inclusive decays is parametrically much smaller than that expected in $R^{+/0} - 1$. That is, it is very small, of order, $\epsilon_I \lambda_i / m_b^2 < 10^{-3}$ and can be safely neglected.

Isospin-breaking effects for exclusive semileptonic decays were studied in [12]. It was shown that linear isospin breaking terms in $B \rightarrow D$ semileptonic decay distributions are zeroth order in $1/m_b$; however, they become $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon_I^2)$ when integrated over phase space. Thus, also for exclusive semileptonic decays, isospin-breaking effects can be neglected compared to those expected in $R^{+/0} - 1$.

We now discuss the semileptonic branching ratios to charmed final states for B^+ and B^0 , denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{+,c}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{0,c}$, which are expected if $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow X_c^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow X_c^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$. The B semileptonic branching ratio, averaged over B^+ and B^0 decays, is $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{SL}} = (10.95 \pm 0.15)\%$ [3]. From this one must subtract approximately 2% of its value, or 0.22%, for $b \rightarrow u$ semileptonic decays, leaving $(10.73 \pm 0.15)\%$. We take account of the lifetime ratio $r_\tau \equiv \tau(B^+)/\tau(B^0) = 1.076 \pm 0.008$ [3]. In order to obtain separate branching ratios for B^+ and B^0 one may assume that $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{SL}}$ is due to equal B^+ and B^0 contributions. The effect of a difference between these two contributions on determining $\mathcal{B}_{+,c} - \mathcal{B}_{0,c}$ is second order in isospin breaking, involving the product $(R^{+/0} - 1)(r_\tau - 1)$. One then expects

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_{+,c} &\equiv \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow X_c^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = (11.12 \pm 0.16)\% \quad , \\ \mathcal{B}_{0,c} &\equiv \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow X_c^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = (10.34 \pm 0.15)\% \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

It is easier to measure the total semileptonic rate, including the small contribution of X_u final states. In principle the so-called “weak annihilation” contribution [13] can lead to differences between $\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow X_u^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$ and $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow X_u^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$. Upper limits on this process have been placed recently [14]. These effects vanish in the $m_b \rightarrow \infty$ limit and will be neglected. In that case one expects

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_+ &\equiv \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow X^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = (11.35 \pm 0.16)\% \quad , \\ \mathcal{B}_0 &\equiv \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow X^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = (10.55 \pm 0.15)\% \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

and it is these predictions (and particularly their ratio $\mathcal{B}_+/\mathcal{B}_0 = r_\tau$) that one wishes to test.

Consider a total sample of N_+ charged B and N_0 neutral B mesons. (At present both BaBar and Belle have accumulated several hundred million $B\bar{B}$ pairs.) Inclusive B semileptonic decays are to be identified opposite fully reconstructed B^- or $\bar{B}^0$ mesons. In what follows, sums of the quoted states and their charge conjugates are implied unless otherwise noted.

Take the example of charged B mesons; similar considerations apply to neutral B 's. Assume an efficiency ϵ_- for fully reconstructing a produced B^- , and an efficiency ϵ_+^{SL} for detecting a B^+ semileptonic decay. The total number of tagged B^+ opposite a reconstructed B^- will be $N_+^{\text{tag}} = \epsilon_- N_+$, while the number of detected semileptonic decays will be $\epsilon_- N_+ \epsilon_+^{\text{SL}} \mathcal{B}_+$. The relative statistical error on this quantity will be the reciprocal of its square root. Taking representative numbers of $N_+ = 2.5 \times 10^8$, $\epsilon_- = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ [15],

$\epsilon_+^{\text{SL}} = 0.5$, and $\mathcal{B}_+ = 11.35\%$, one finds

$$\frac{\Delta\mathcal{B}_+}{\mathcal{B}_+} = \left(\frac{2.5 \times 10^8}{N_+}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{5 \times 10^{-3}}{\epsilon_-}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{0.5}{\epsilon_+^{\text{SL}}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{11.35\%}{\mathcal{B}_+}\right)^{1/2} \times 0.38\% \quad (7)$$

A similar calculation may be applied to $\Delta\mathcal{B}_0/\mathcal{B}_0$; the nominal reconstruction efficiency for B^0 's at BaBar is $\epsilon_0 = 3 \times 10^{-3}$ [15]. The dominant errors in the determination of $\mathcal{B}_{+,0}$ and their ratio are unlikely to be statistical. They are likely to arise from uncertainties in the efficiencies $\epsilon_{+,0}^{\text{SL}}$ and hence will require Monte Carlo simulation. In any case there seem to be no problem to attain a statistical accuracy on $\mathcal{B}_+/\mathcal{B}_0$ at the percent level with present BaBar and Belle samples.

Note that in order to measure the branching ratios one does not need to know the tagging efficiencies $\epsilon_{-,0}$, at least if these do not depend on whether a semileptonic decay is observed opposite the tagged meson. However, in order to learn the ratio $R^{+/0} = N_+/N_0$ one needs the tagging efficiencies as well as the lifetime ratio $r_\tau = \tau_+/\tau_0$. In that case one has

$$\frac{N_+^{\text{SL}}}{N_0^{\text{SL}}} = \frac{\epsilon_- \epsilon_+^{\text{SL}}}{\epsilon_0 \epsilon_0^{\text{SL}}} R^{+/0} \frac{\tau_+}{\tau_0} \quad (8)$$

The accuracy of this determination is likely to be governed almost completely by the accuracy of prediction or measurement of the tagging efficiencies.

In the absence of sufficiently precise information on $\epsilon_{-,0}$ one may attempt to measure the ratio of semileptonic B^+ and B^0 decays *inclusively* at the $\Upsilon(4S)$. This would require identifying whether a given lepton comes from a vertex with an even (B^0) or odd (B^+) number of tracks. While resolutions on individual tracks at Belle and BaBar are unlikely to be good enough to permit this, one might be able to use events with two opposite-sign primary leptons from B and $\bar{B}$ decays to help define two disjoint vertices, particularly if one is willing to select events with long B and $\bar{B}$ lifetimes [16].

Since isospin breaking is also expected to be small in exclusive semileptonic modes [12], one could obtain $R^{+/0} = f_{+-}/f_{00}$ by measuring f_{+-} , since f_{00} is already known to a couple of percent of its value [5]. Comparison of single and double $D^* \ell \nu_\ell$ production in the same manner as was used to obtain f_{00} is difficult because the soft-charged-pion signature of $D^{*\pm} \rightarrow \pi^\pm D^0(\bar{D}^0)$ which was so useful in measuring f_{00} via $D^{*\pm} \ell \nu_\ell$ production is not available in D^{*0} decay. One might be able to make use of the soft *neutral* pion in $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0$ to measure f_{+-} via single and double exclusive semileptonic decay. This method was used in Ref. [17] to obtain $f_{+-}/f_{00} = 1.058 \pm 0.084 \pm 0.136$ based on CLEO II data.

We now evaluate the expected accuracy of a double-tag method for determining $R^{+/0}$. Again we concentrate on determining the number of charged B 's; similar methods apply to neutral B 's. The number of singly-tagged B^+ is $N_+^{\text{single}} = N_+ \epsilon_-$, while the number of doubly-reconstructed $B^+ B^-$ pairs is $N_{\text{chg}}^{\text{dbl}} = N_+ \epsilon_- \epsilon_+^{(-)}$. Here $\epsilon_+^{(-)}$ is the number of B^+ which can be reconstructed *opposite an already-reconstructed* B^- . We expect that $\epsilon_+^{(-)} \geq \epsilon_-$. In other words, once a B^- has already been reconstructed it should be at least as easy to reconstruct its B^+ partner as it would have been to reconstruct a B^- or B^+ alone.

The efficiencies roughly cancel out in the expression

$$N_+ = \frac{(N_+^{\text{single}})^2}{N_{\text{chg}}^{\text{dbl}}} \frac{\epsilon_+^{(-)}}{\epsilon_-} \quad . \quad (9)$$

A Monte Carlo simulation is needed to estimate $\epsilon_+^{(-)}/\epsilon_-$. The relative statistical error on N_+ is dominated by that on $N_{\text{chg}}^{\text{dbl}}$ and is

$$\left| \frac{\Delta N_+}{N_+} \right| \simeq (N_{\text{chg}}^{\text{dbl}})^{-1/2} \quad . \quad (10)$$

For a 1% determination of N_+ one needs $N_{\text{chg}}^{\text{dbl}} \simeq 10^4$, which would require 4×10^8 B^+ events if both ϵ_- and $\epsilon_+^{(-)}$ were 5×10^{-3} . The improvement of reconstruction efficiencies beyond this value thus is of prime importance.

To conclude, we have discussed alternative methods for measuring the isospin breaking quantity, $R^{+/0} - 1$ which are based on semileptonic decays. The theoretical advantage of these methods over methods based on exclusive hadronic decays such as $B \rightarrow J/\psi K$ is that isospin breaking in semileptonic decays is known to be parametrically smaller than in $R^{+/0} - 1$.

We thank Romulus Godang, Zoltan Ligeti, Dan Pirjol, Aaron Roodman and Marie-Helene Schune for useful discussions. J. L. R. wishes to thank the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology for gracious hospitality during part of this work. This work was supported in part by the United States Department of Energy through Grant No. DE FG02 90ER40560, by the Israel Science Foundation under Grants No. 1052/04 and 378/05, and by the German–Israeli Foundation under Grant No. I-781-55.14/2003.

References

- [1] M. B. Voloshin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18**, 1783 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301076], and earlier references therein; R. Kaiser *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 142001 (2003); Soo-hyeon Nam, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **20**, 95 (2005).
- [2] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **69**, 071101 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0401028]; and earlier references therein.
- [3] Heavy Flavor Averaging Group(HFAG), “Averages of b -hadron properties as of winter 2005,” arXiv:hep-ex/0505100. For updated version, prepared after the summer and fall 2005 conferences, see <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>.
- [4] R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. B **506**, 311 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0101276].
- [5] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 042001 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0504001].
- [6] B. Barish *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1570 (1996).

- [7] J. Adler *et al.* [MARK-III Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 89 (1988).
- [8] Q. He *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 121801 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0504003].
- [9] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 071502 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211069].
- [10] M. Beneke and T. Feldmann, Nucl. Phys. B **592**, 3 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0008255].
- [11] For a review see, for example, A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Camb. Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **10**, 1 (2000).
- [12] M. B. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. B **433**, 419 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9803243].
- [13] I. I. Y. Bigi and N. G. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. B **423**, 33 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9310285].
- [14] J. L. Rosner *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0601027; T. O. Meyer, “Limits on weak annihilation in inclusive charmless semileptonic B decays,” Ph. D. Thesis, Cornell University, 2005, UMI-31-62893, <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?r=umi-31-62893>.
- [15] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], presented at EPS International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics (HEPP-EPS 2005), Lisbon, Portugal, 21–27 July 2005, arXiv:hep-ex/0507085.
- [16] We thank Aaron Roodman for this suggestion.
- [17] S. B. Athar *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **66**, 052003 (2002).